arXiv:1602.07299v1 [quant-ph] 23 Feb 2016

Improved power-series method for confined one-dimensional quantum-mechanical problems

Francisco M. Fernández*
INIFTA (UNLP, CCT La Plata-CONICET), División Química Teórica,
Blvd. 113 S/N, Sucursal 4, Casilla de Correo 16,
1900 La Plata, Argentina

February 25, 2016

Abstract

We propose two improvements to the well-known power series method for confined one-dimensional quantum-mechanical problems. They consist of the addition of a variational step were the energy plays the role of a variational parameter. We compare the rate of convergence of the three methods on an exactly-solvable model. We also outline possible generalizations of the approaches to more complex problems.

1 Introduction

Confined quantum-mechanical models have proved suitable for the study of several physical phenomena and there is a vast literature on the subject [1]. Here we are interested in a power-series approach that is suitable for obtaining accurate solutions to simple models. As an example, Patil and Varshni [2] applied it to the hydrogen atom in a spherical box with impenetrable walls. The approach consists of calculating a finite number of terms of the Taylor

*fernande@quimica.unlp.edu.ar

series of the solution about the center of the box at $r = 0$ and then requiring that the solution satisfies the boundary condition on the wall at $r = R$. From the resulting equation one obtains an approximate energy that becomes increasingly accurate as the number of terms in the power series increases.

The purpose of this paper is to propose two possible improvements to the power-series approach outlined above. In section 2 we briefly discuss the Schrödinger equation for a sufficiently general one-dimensional confined model. In section 3 we develop the main ideas of those methods. In section 4 we choose a benchmark model for the comparative application of the approaches. The chosen model can be solved exactly and is therefore useful for monitoring the rate of convergence of the methods because none of them yields the exact analytical result. Finally, in section 5 we summarize the main results of the paper and draw conclusions.

2 One-dimensional confined model

For simplicity and concreteness we consider the one-dimensional Schrödinger equation

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\psi''(x) + V(x)\psi(x) = E\psi(x), \tag{1}$$

with the boundary conditions

$$\psi(L_1) = \psi(L_2) = 0, \tag{2}$$

that describes the quantum-mechanical behaviour of a particle of mass m confined to a box with impenetrable walls at $x = L_1$ and $x = L_2$ under the effect of a potential $V(x)$.

It is convenient to convert this equation into a dimensionless one by means of the change of variables

$$q = \frac{x - x_0}{L},\ L = L_2 - L_1,\ L_1 \le x_0 \le L_2, \tag{3}$$

that leads to

$$-\varphi''(q) + v(q)\varphi(q) = \epsilon\varphi(q), \tag{4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(q) &= \psi\left(Lq + x_0\right), \\ v(q) &= \frac{2mL^2}{\hbar^2} V\left(Lq + x_0\right), \\ \epsilon &= \frac{2mL^2}{\hbar^2} E. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The boundary conditions now become

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(l_1) &= \varphi(l_2) = 0, \\ l_1 &= \frac{L_1 - x_0}{L},\ l_2 = \frac{L_2 - x_0}{L}. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

3 Power-series approaches

The rate of convergence of the approaches discussed in what follows may depend on the choice of x_0; however, in order to keep present discussion as simple as possible we arbitrarily choose $x_0 = L_1$ so that $l_1 = 0$ and $l_2 = 1$.

We assume that the potential can be expanded in a Taylor series about $q = 0$:

$$v(q) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} v_j q^j. \tag{7}$$

This fact allows us to try a power-series solution

$$\varphi(q) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j q^j, \tag{8}$$

where $c_0 = c_2 = 0$ because of the boundary condition at $q = 0$ and the differential equation.

If we substitute the series (8) and (7) for $\varphi(q)$ and $v(q)$ in equation (4), respectively, we obtain the recurrence relation

$$c_j = \frac{1}{j(j-1)} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{j-2} v_{j-i-2} c_i - \epsilon c_{j-2} \right),\ j = 3, 4, \ldots. \tag{9}$$

All the coefficients are proportional to c_1 that we may arbitrarily choose equal to unity. In this way we have: $c_0 = 0$, $c_1 = 1$, $c_2 = 0$ and the remaining c_j, $j > 2$, are polynomial functions of the dimensionless energy ϵ.

In what follows we discuss three alternative approaches based on the power-series ansatz

$$\varphi^{[N]}(q) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j q^j. \tag{10}$$

The first one (A_1) consists of calculating the coefficients c_j, $j = 3, 4, \ldots, N$ from the recurrence relation (9) and then determining the approximate dimensionless energy from the boundary condition at $q = 1$:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j(\epsilon) = 0. \tag{11}$$

In this way we obtain an approximation $\epsilon(A_1)$ to the eigenvalue. This is exactly the approach used by Patil and Varshni [2] for the confined hydrogen atom.

In the second approach (A_2) we calculate the coefficients c_j, $j = 3, 4, \ldots, N-1$, from the recurrence relation (9) and c_N from the boundary condition (11) thus obtaining the ansatz

$$\varphi^{[N]}(q) = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} c_j(\epsilon) \left(q^j - q^N\right). \tag{12}$$

Since this function satisfies both boundary conditions we can use it as a trial function for the variational method and calculate the variational integral

$$\begin{aligned} W^{[N]}(\epsilon) &= \frac{\int_0^1 \varphi^{[N]}(q) H \varphi^{[N]}(q)\, dq}{\int_0^1 \varphi^{[N]}(q)^2\, dq}, \\ H &= -\frac{d}{dq^2} + v(q), \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where ϵ plays the role of a variational parameter. The optimal approximate eigenvalue is given by

$$\begin{aligned} W^{[N]}(A_2) &= W^{[N]}(\epsilon(A_2)) \\ \left.\frac{dW^{[N]}(\epsilon)}{d\epsilon}\right|_{\epsilon=\epsilon(A_2)} &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

In this case we obtain two estimates of the eigenvalue $\epsilon(A_2)$ and $W^{[N]}(A_2)$ that in general do not agree, and the variational theorem tells us that $W^{[N]}(A_2)$ is an upper bound to the exact ground-state energy ϵ_0.

As we will show in the next section, $\epsilon(A_2)$ and $W^{[N]}(A_2)$ approach each other as N increases which suggests a third approach (A_3) that consists of obtaining the approximate eigenvalue $\epsilon(A_3)$ as a root of the equation

$$\epsilon = W^{[N]}(\epsilon). \tag{15}$$

4 Simple benchmark problem

In what follows we consider a simple model for the problem of a crystal in an electric field. The equation for the semifree electron in a one-dimensional crystal is given by (1) with $V(x) = Fex$, where F is the strength of the electric field and m and $-e$ are the electron mass and charge, respectively [3]. When $L_1 = 0$ and $L_2 = L$ the corresponding dimensionless eigenvalue equation is given by (4) with $v(q) = \lambda q$, where $\lambda = 2mL^3Fe/\hbar^2$.

By means of the change of variables

$$z = \lambda^{1/3} q - \frac{\epsilon}{\lambda^{2/3}}, \tag{16}$$

the eigenvalue equation becomes the Airy equation [4]

$$Y''(z) - zY(z) = 0, \tag{17}$$

where $Y(z) = \varphi\left(\lambda^{-1/3}z + \lambda^{-1}\epsilon\right)$. The solution is a linear combination $Y(z) = C_1 Ai(z) + C_2 Bi(z)$ of the Airy functions $Ai(z)$ and $Bi(z)$ [4]. The boundary conditions at $q = 0$ and $q = 1$ lead to the quantization condition

$$A_i\left(-\lambda^{-2/3}\epsilon\right) B_i\left(\lambda^{1/3} - \lambda^{-2/3}\epsilon\right) - Ai\left(\lambda^{1/3} - \lambda^{-2/3}\epsilon\right) Bi\left(-\lambda^{-2/3}\epsilon\right) = 0, \tag{18}$$

that yields $\epsilon(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda \neq 0$.

For $\lambda = 0$ the exact solutions are those for the particle in a box

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{n-1}(q) &= \sqrt{2}\sin(n\pi q) \\ \epsilon_{n-1} &= n^2\pi^2,\ n = 1, 2, \ldots \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Tables 1 and 2 show results for $\lambda = 0$ and $\lambda = 1$, respectively. In both cases we appreciate that $W(A_2)$ and $\epsilon(A_3)$ are better estimates of ϵ_0 than

$\epsilon(A_1)$. Besides, $W(A_2)$ is an upper bound to ϵ_0 as expected from its variational origin and $\epsilon(A_2)$ and $W(A_2)$ approach each other as N increases. The exact results are $\epsilon_0(\lambda = 0) = \pi^2 \approx 9.8696044010893586191$ and $\epsilon_0(\lambda = 1) \approx 10.368507161836337127$.

Table 3 shows results for the approach A_1 for greater values of N. While A_2 and A_3 yield an accuracy of 10 digits for $N = 12$ ($\lambda = 1$) and $N = 13$ ($\lambda = 0$), A_1 requires as much as $N = 21$. However, the latter approach is much simpler because it does not require the calculation of integrals. The three approaches are based on a local approximation (the Taylor series about $q = 0$) but only A_1 is purely local.

The variational approach A_2 is not the best one based on the expansion (12). If we define the set of functions

$$f_{N,j} = q^j - q^N,\ j = 1, 2, \ldots, N-1 \tag{20}$$

then the Rayleigh-Ritz method leads to the secular equation [5]

$$(\mathbf{H} - \epsilon\mathbf{S})\,\mathbf{C} = 0, \tag{21}$$

where $\mathbf{H}$ and $\mathbf{S}$ are $(N-1) \times (N-1)$ square matrices with elements

$$H_{ij} = \langle f_{N,i}|\, H\, |f_{N,j}\rangle\,,\ S_{ij} = \langle f_{N,i}\, |f_{N,j}\rangle\,, \tag{22}$$

and $\mathbf{C}$ is a the column vector of the coefficients c_i, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N-1$. The approximate eigenvalues are given by the roots of the secular determinant

$$|\mathbf{H} - \epsilon\mathbf{S}| = \mathbf{0}. \tag{23}$$

In order to apply the Rayleigh-Ritz method we have defined the scalar product

$$\langle f\ |g\rangle = \int_0^1 f(q)g(q)\,dq. \tag{24}$$

Table 4 shows approximate results for the lowest eigenvalue ϵ_0. We appreciate that the rate of convergence of the Rayleigh-Ritz method is greater than those for the approaches A_2 and A_3. However, we cannot consider that it is a true improvement of the power-series method because it is based on an entirely different philosophy.

5 Conclusions

The purpose of this paper is to show that one can easily improve the rate of convergence of the well-known power-series method for the calculation of eigenvalues. The main idea is to introduce a global approximation into the otherwise completely local approach. The main disadvantage of the global approximations is that they require the calculation of integrals that one may not be able to obtain analytically for some potentials $v(q)$. The use of numerical integration in such unfavourable cases makes the global approaches less appealing than the local one that completely avoids integrals. The latter approach is just based on the Taylor expansion of the potential-energy function about a chosen coordinate point.

We have also discussed the Rayleigh-Ritz variational method just for the purpose of comparison. This approach is not based on the expansion about a given point and is completely global despite the fact that the form of the series (12) led us to the choice of the basis set (20).

It is not difficult to extend the methods discussed above to more complex problems. First, we choose a suitable ansatz $\psi(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{x})$, where $\mathbf{c}$ is a set of linear parameters and $\mathbf{x}$ the set of coordinates that describe the quantum-mechanical system. Second we force the ansatz to satisfy the Schrödinger equation $H\psi = E\psi$ and some of its derivatives with respect to $\mathbf{x}$ at a chosen point $\mathbf{x}_0$. In this way we obtain $\mathbf{c}(\epsilon)$. Third, we minimize the variational integral $W(\epsilon)$ with respect to ϵ or solve the equation $\epsilon = W(\epsilon)$.

One can also imagine variants of the technique just outlined. For example, we can force the ansatz to satisfy the Schrödinger equation at a set of coordinate points $\mathbf{x}_i$, $i = 0, 1, \ldots$ (including some of the derivatives with respect to the coordinates). Besides, the ansatz $\psi(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$ may also contain a set of nonlinear adjustable parameters $\mathbf{a}$ that we obtain, together with ϵ, in the variational part of the method that consists of minimizing $W(\mathbf{a}, \epsilon)$. As we appreciate, the method is quite flexible and offers several variants that we may select in accordance with the chosen problem.

References

[1] See, for example, Adv. Quantum Chem. volumes 57 and 58

[2] S. H. Patil and Y. P. Varshni, "Properties of confined hydrogen and helium atoms", Adv. Quantum Chem. **57**, 1-24 (2009).

[3] A. Rabinovitch and J. Zak, "Electrons in crystals in a finite-range electric field", Phys. Rev. B **4**, 2358-2370 (1971).

[4] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, Ninth ed. (Dover, New York, 1972).

[5] F. L. Pilar, *Elementary Quantum Chemistry*, (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1968).

Table 1: Estimates of ϵ_0 for $\lambda = 0$

N	$\epsilon(A_1)$	$\epsilon(A_2)$	$W(A_2)$	$\epsilon(A_3)$
4	6	12.08941897	9.870757651	9.9717028
5	–	9.101852828	9.875388202	9.949871274
6	–	9.558639637	9.870985812	9.881622575
7	9.478038438	9.960092497	9.86992353	9.870713549
8	9.478038438	9.905617739	9.869662206	9.869825364
9	9.914249166	9.863621098	9.869607064	9.869612707
10	9.914249166	9.867032812	9.869604943	9.869606146
11	9.866812676	9.869907624	9.869604411	9.86960443
12	9.866812676	9.869739577	9.869604403	9.869604407
13	9.869737257	9.869592550	9.869604401	9.869604401

Table 2: Estimates of ϵ_0 for $\lambda = 1$

N	$\epsilon(A_1)$	$\epsilon(A_2)$	$W(A_2)$	$\epsilon(A_3)$
4	6.5	12.26637996	10.36907124	10.44756346
5	–	9.434668415	10.37615238	10.50115579
6	–	10.11267971	10.36932531	10.37634015
7	9.568181651	10.51534961	10.36928674	10.37131465
8	10	10.39424448	10.36853346	10.36861906
9	10.53613098	10.3551899	10.36851922	10.36854793
10	10.40454178	10.36714011	10.36850729	10.36850764
11	10.35308651	10.36945371	10.36850725	10.36850744
12	10.36699657	10.36853572	10.36850716	10.36850716
13	10.36959361	10.36845690	10.36850716	10.36850716

Table 3: Convergence of the estimate of ϵ_0 from the method A_1

N	$\epsilon(A_1, \lambda = 0)$	$\epsilon(A_1, \lambda = 1)$
15	9.869599545	10.36845326
16	9.869599545	10.36851066
17	9.869604541	10.36850904
18	9.869604541	10.36850690
19	9.869604397	10.36850711
20	9.869604397	10.36850717
21	9.869604401	10.36850716

Table 4: Rayleigh-Ritz method

N	$\lambda = 0$	$\lambda = 1$
4	9.869749621	10.36873394
6	9.869604434	10.36850740
8	9.869604401	10.36850716